



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/712,544

11/13/2003

Scott Carrier

RSW9-2003-00233US1

9171

(7161-

7590

12/27/2005

EXAMINER

BOTTS, MICHAEL K

Steven M. Greenberg, Esquire
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
Suite 2040
200 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 12/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/712,544	Applicant(s) CARRIER, SCOTT	
	Examiner Michael K. Botts	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/13/03.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/13/03</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This document is the first Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive to the following communications: The Non-Provisional Application, which was filed on November 13, 2003, and an Information Disclosure Statement, which was also filed on November 13, 2003.
2. Claims 1-14 have been examined, with claims 1, 6, 10, and 11 being the independent claims.
3. Claims 1-14 are rejected.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. An initialed and dated copy of applicant's IDS form 1449, which was filed on November 13, 2003, is attached to this Office Action.

Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Scholz, et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0078949, filed April 30, 2001 and published April 24, 2003) [hereinafter "Scholz"].

Regarding **independent claim 1**, Scholz teaches:

A lightweight pattern validation system comprising:

a validation processor configured with a prototype interface for receiving both a field validation pattern and also form based input to be validated against said field validation pattern; and,

a validation script library packaging said validation process.

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0116], teaching a "form processor" as a separate component or module. See also, Scholz, paragraph [0131], teaching the custom tags, for the validation, implemented as an object model stored in the tag library.)

Regarding **dependent claim 2**, Scholz teaches:

The system of claim 1, further comprising:

a library reference to said script library disposed within markup defining a form having at least one form based input field programmed for validation using said validation processor; and,

a function call to said validation processor further disposed in said markup, said function call having a configuration for passing a reference to a

value in said at least one form based input field for validation in said validation processor.

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0109], teaching validation by reference to the validation code. And see, Scholz, paragraphs [0131]-[0132], teaching the custom tag library and the FormCollection object.)

Regarding **dependent claim 3**, Scholz teaches:

The system of claim 2, further comprising a plurality of additional function calls to said validation processor disposed in said markup, each additional one of said functional calls having a configuration for passing a reference to a value in a corresponding form based input field for validation in said validation processor.

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0147], teaching multiple tags and, inherently, multiple function calls to those tags.)

Regarding **dependent claim 4**, Scholz teaches:

The system of claim 2, further comprising a validation shell function encapsulating said function call.

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0131], teaching the FormCollection library and functions calls contained therein.)

Regarding **dependent claim 5**, Scholz teaches:

The system of claim 3, further comprising a validation shell function encapsulating said function call.

(See, Scholz, paragraph 0131, teaching the tag library containing the FormCollection of function calls.)

Regarding **independent claim 6**, Scholz teaches:

A pattern validation method comprising the steps of:
retrieving a value for a form based input field from a form defined in markup rendered in a content browser;
passing said retrieved value along with a validation pattern for said form based input field to a validation process disposed within a lightweight validation library coupled to said rendered markup; and,
validating said retrieved value according to said validation pattern in said content browser.

(See, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0175], teaching retrieving input, passing the input value, and validating the retrieved value according to a valuation pattern within the content browser. Specifically, see Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with a markup language, HTML and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.)

Regarding **dependent claim 7**, Scholz teaches:

The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of repeating said retrieving, passing and validating steps for at least one additional value for at least one additional form based input field disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0147], teaching multiple tags and, inherently, multiple function calls to those tags.)

Regarding **dependent claim 8**, Scholz teaches:

The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of performing said retrieving, passing, and validating steps in a validation shell function disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with a markup language, HTML and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.)

Regarding **dependent claim 9**, Scholz teaches:

The method of claim 7, further comprising the step of performing said retrieving, passing, validating and repeating steps in a validation shell function disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.

(See, Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with a markup language, HTML and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.)

Regarding **independent claim 10**, Scholz teaches:

A pattern validation method comprising the steps of:
defining a pattern validation routine to validate form based input provided through a prototype interface to said routine based upon a validation pattern also provided through said prototype interface; packaging said pattern validation routine into a lightweight validation script library;
referencing said lightweight validation script library in markup disposed within a content server configured to distribute said markup to requesting clients;
defining at least one form based input field in said markup and further defining a validation pattern for each of said at least one form based input fields;
and,
for each form based input field and defined validation pattern, disposing a function call to said pattern validation routine in said lightweight script library.

(See, Scholz, paragraphs [0092]-[0175], teaching retrieving input, passing the input value, and validating the retrieved value according to a valuation pattern within the content browser. Specifically, see Scholz, paragraph [0092] teaching the validation with a markup language, HTML and/or XML, in a client-side valuation.

See also, Scholz, paragraph 0116, teaching the separate validating component or module.

See also, Scholz, paragraph [0174], teaching that the code could alternatively be executed at a server.

See also, Scholz, paragraphs [0131]-[0132], teaching a custom tag library and FormCollection object, with function calls.)

Regarding **independent claim 11**, Scholz teaches:

A machine readable storage having stored thereon a computer program for pattern validation, the computer program comprising a routine set of instructions which when executed by the machine cause the machine to perform the steps of:

retrieving a value for a form based input field from a form defined in markup rendered in a content browser;

passing said retrieved value along with a validation pattern for said form based input field to a validation process disposed within a lightweight validation library coupled to said rendered markup; and,

validating said retrieved value according to said validation pattern in said content browser.

(Claim 11 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 6, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 12**, Scholz teaches:

The machine readable storage of claim 11, further comprising the step of repeating said retrieving, passing and validating steps for at least one additional

value for at least one additional form based input field disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.

(Claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 7, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 13**, Scholz teaches:

The machine readable storage of claim 11, further comprising the step of performing said retrieving, passing, and validating steps in a validation shell function disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.

(Claim 13 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 8, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

Regarding **dependent claim 14**, Scholz teaches:

The machine readable storage of claim 12, further comprising the step of performing said retrieving, passing, validating and repeating steps in a validation shell function disposed in said markup rendered in said content browser.

(Claim 14 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claim 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.)

5. It is noted that any citations to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon

for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art.
See, MPEP 2123.

Conclusion

6. The following prior art is made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure:

Raz (U.S. Patent 6,292,827), teaching validation functions to a markup language electronic document.

Brill, G., "Code Notes for ASP.NET," Random House, Inc., 2002, Chapter 5, teaching validation functions and techniques for markup languages.

Tsachev, M., "Form Validation on the Client Side," Sitepoint article, September 8, 2002, last downloaded by the Examiner on December 10, 2005 from:
www.sitepoint.com/print/form-validation-client-side.

Lemay, W., "Wilma Lemay's JavaScript," Sams.net Publishing, 1996, pages 132-137, teaching validation form data with event handlers.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2176

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
12/11/2005